

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS *AMPHISBAENA MILDEI*
PETERS, 1878. Z.N.(S.) 1746

(see volume 23, pages 162-163; volume 24, pages 8, 209)

By Carl Gans (*University of New York, Buffalo, New York, U.S.A.*)

Some time ago, I found out by accident that the Nomenclature Committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists had taken a negative position on my proposal to suppress the name *Amphisbaena mildei* Peters, 1878. After some argument, I have finally obtained a copy of their letter of 10 April giving their position. I wish to express my objection to the views there indicated for the reasons given as follows:

1. I discussed this question while at the British Museum and asked and received the welcome assistance of the office of the Commission in clarifying the situation and preparing a petition. The facts presented at that time have not changed nor are they in question.

2. Since that time and in expectation that the proposal would meet no serious objection I have published the substitute name in a checklist (*Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* 135 (2) : 70) and in a major paper (*Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* 136 (3) : 232, 237).

3. The recommendation of the A.S.I.H. Committee appears to be based upon the idea that this group of "lizards is of little significance to biologists outside of taxonomy." This is a subjective statement. It may well be the opinion of this committee but it is precisely the intention of the code to avoid name changes due to such subjective judgements.

4. The selection of a neotype in either of the two modes suggested by the A.S.I.H. Committee is not a satisfactory alternative since it would not be certain to stabilize these names. The holotype of *A. mildei* was lost rather than destroyed. It is entirely possible that it or some other "possibly pertinent, specimen" may some day be "rediscovered." In this case, a new petition would have to be drawn according to Art. 75f.

Under the circumstances, I should appreciate a favourable consideration of this petition.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF SCUTELLUIDAE
RICHTER & RICHTER, 1925. Z.N.(S.) 1789

(see volume 24, pages 230-233, 322-323)

By J. T. Temple (*Birkbeck College, London, W.C.1, England*)

This is a difficult case, but on balance and not without some regret I think that THYSANOPELTIDAE is to be preferred to SCUTELLUIDAE. The latter cannot be considered so firmly entrenched that its replacement would seriously embarrass trilobite specialists, while THYSANOPELTIDAE has been used on at least one other occasion since 1959 (i.e. Příbyl & Vaněk in 1962). The relatively slight inconvenience to trilobite specialists of using THYSANOPELTIDAE should not outweigh the permanent possibility of confusion of SCUTELLUIDAE with its echinoid near-homonym.